UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,	Case No. CR 7-292-9431
Plaintiff, v.	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
JOE Brown Tepht3	MAY 26 2017 SUSAN Y. SOONG NORTHEDN U.S. DISTRICT
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on under the Speedy Trial Act from 2017 to 2017 to 2017 and finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):	
Failure to grant a continuance w See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i)	ould be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of or law, that it is unreasonable to	the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial elished by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	ould deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	
	ould unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time on, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
IT IS SO ORDERED.	
DATED: Sub 2017	JOSEPH C. SPERO Chief Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED:	ght be
Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney